

appellate court bill was enacted, they included the first statute mentioned. The language said Sections 29-301 to 29-304. All that was put in the appellate court bill was 29-301. Inadvertently, they struck to 29- and the remainder that made up that group of statutes. So that is what the amendment that I am offering would do. There was no opposition to either the bill or the amendment. It is not a complicated issue, so I am asking that you adopt this amendment.

SPEAKER BAACK: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Senator Hohenstein, followed Senator Vrtiska, Senator Landis, and Senator Hall. Senator Hohenstein.

SENATOR HOHENSTEIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to delay this. I have a couple of questions. First, I would like to ask Senator Hall a couple of questions.

SPEAKER BAACK: Senator Hall, would you respond, please.

SENATOR HALL: Yes.

SENATOR HOHENSTEIN: On the bill, 652, is it true that a person under the age of 18 could be taken to a police station simply for questioning, and they would have the right before they were asked any questions to call an attorney if this bill is passed?

SENATOR HALL: Yes, under the standard of the bill, the way the bill reads, technically that would be true.

SENATOR HOHENSTEIN: Okay, in other words, a witness for instance to a criminal occurrence, the police would not technically be able to question the witness about the events and, in fact, if the person wanted to consult with an attorney rather than just call them on the phone, you would have to wait, essentially, for the attorney to arrive at the police station?

SENATOR HALL: Well, it would depend, Senator Hohenstein, on whether or not the juvenile went of his own free will or her own free will, or if they were basically taken into custody for purposes of that. If it was a witness who the police asked to come down, they volunteered to come down, that would be different than somebody who was, you know, arrested, deprived of their liberty, or detained. Because if the juvenile would have the free will to leave at any point in time, no, then this statute would not kick in.